TWENTY-SEVENTH
ANNUAL REPORT

EXTENSION SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

FOR THE YEAR 1941

COLLEGE PARK
MARYLAND

EXTENSION SERVICE
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Board of Regents of the University of Maryland and The Maryland State Board of Agriculture

HENRY HOLZAPFEL, JR., *Chairman*.....Hagerstown
ROLAND K. ADAMS, *Vice-Chairman*.....Baltimore
MRS. JOHN L. WHITEHURST, *Secretary*.....Baltimore
J. MILTON PATTERSON, *Treasurer*.....Baltimore
W. CALVIN CHESNUT.....Towson
WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.....Baltimore
JOHN E. SEMMES.....Parkton
P. C. TURNER.....
*

H. C. BYRD.....*President and Executive Officer*

* The Board of Regents and Maryland State Board of Agriculture consists of eleven members. At present there are three vacancies.

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Service, University of Maryland and United States Department of Agriculture, Cooperating.
T. B. SYMONS, Director
(Distributed in furtherance of Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914)

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

DR. H. C. BYRD,

President, University of Maryland:

I have the honor to present herewith the Twenty-Seventh Annual Report covering the work of the Extension Service of the University of Maryland, in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, for the calendar year 1941, together with a financial report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS B. SYMONS,
Director, Extension Service.

January 1, 1942.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY HERBERT R. O'CONOR,

Governor of Maryland:

In accordance with the requirements of the Act of Congress approved May 8, 1914, and known as the Smith-Lever Act, I have the honor to transmit herewith the Twenty-Seventh Annual Report covering the work of the Extension Service of the University of Maryland, in cooperat on with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, for the calendar year 1941, together with a financial report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

Respectfully submitted,

H. C. BYRD,
President.

January 4, 1942.

The Board of Regents of the University of Maryland and The Maryland State Board of Agriculture

HENRY HOLZAPFEL, JR., *Chairman*	Hagerstown
ROLAND K. ADAMS, *Vice-Chairman*	Baltimore
MRS. JOHN L. WHITEHURST, *Secretary*	Baltimore
J. MILTON PATTERSON, *Treasurer*	Baltimore
W. CALVIN CHESNUT	Towson
WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.	Baltimore
JOHN E. SEMMES	Parkton
P. C. TURNER	
*	
H. C. BYRD	*President and Executive Officer*

* The Board of Regents and Maryland State Board of Agriculture consists of eleven members. At present there are three vacancies.

Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, Extension Service, University of Maryland and United States Department of Agriculture, Cooperating.
T. B. SYMONS, Director
(Distributed in furtherance of Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914)

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

DR. H. C. BYRD,

President, University of Maryland:

I have the honor to present herewith the Twenty-Seventh Annual Report covering the work of the Extension Service of the University of Maryland, in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, for the calendar year 1941, together with a financial report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS B. SYMONS,
Director, Extension Service.

January 1, 1942.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY HERBERT R. O'CONOR,

Governor of Maryland:

In accordance with the requirements of the Act of Congress approved May 8, 1914, and known as the Smith-Lever Act, I have the honor to transmit herewith the Twenty-Seventh Annual Report covering the work of the Extension Service of the University of Maryland, in cooperat on with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, for the calendar year 1941, together with a financial report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

Respectfully submitted,

H. C. BYRD,
President.

January 4, 1942.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	5
Farm Labor	6
General Activities	6
Soil Conservation	7
Tobacco Marketing	7
Crop Yields and Values	8
Administration	10
Changes in Personnel	10
Sources of Extension Funds	11
Publications	12
Activities of Extension Agents	13
County Demonstration Work	13
Home Demonstration Work	14
Boys' and Girls' 4-H Club Work	15
Farm Crops and Livestock	16
Field Crops	16
Dairy	17
Livestock	17
Fruits and Vegetables	18
Fruits	18
Vegetables	18
Canning Crops	18
Ornamental Gardening	19
Poultry	19
Forestry	19
Tobacco	20
Insects and Plant Diseases	20
Insect Control	20
Apiculture	21
Plant Diseases	21
Agricultural Engineering	22
Marketing	23
State Horticultural Department	23
Conclusion	23
Employees at Headquarters	24
County Agents	25
Home Demonstration Agents	25
Financial Statement	27

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

EXTENSION SERVICE

FOR THE YEAR, 1941

THOMAS B. SYMONS, Director

INTRODUCTION

AT the request of State authorities, this report is reduced to the minimum. It attempts only to give the briefest account of some of the more important Extension work in a year that demanded unusual services in many lines.

The year 1941 was marked with defense activities which culminated with the declaration of war on December 8. The international situation was extremely uncertain at the beginning of the year and the war in Europe was already presenting problems to the farmers of Maryland. With the passage of the Lend-Lease Act by Congress, a changed situation developed in the production field and consequently added duties were thrust upon the Extension Service. Regular activities and programs were carried on to a considerable extent until late summer, when national, State, county, and individual farm goals were set to meet the needs as they could at that time be foreseen. State and County Defense (now War) Boards were set up by the Secretary of Agriculture to coordinate all Federal activities dealing with agriculture. The Director of Extension was designated a member of the State War Board, and County Agents served as secretaries of County War Boards in their respective counties. The chairmen of State and County AAA Committees were designated chairmen respectively of the State and County War Boards.

It was unfortunate, in the opinion of the writer, that farm organizations and other farm and home leaders were not made members of the State and County Boards, but in this State we have sought the advice of these leaders in developing policies under the new conditions confronting agriculture. Educational work designed to acquaint farm people with the changed conditions, the desired production goals, and other factors affecting their welfare and their contribution to the war efforts has been a major part of extension work.

Farm Labor

AN outstanding endeavor during the year was the assistance rendered by the Extension Service, in cooperation with other agencies, in dealing with the farm labor shortage. Early in the year, with the growing demands of defense industries, a difficult farm labor situation was anticipated. The State Agricultural Planning Committee appointed a sub-committee on farm labor with P. C. Turner, President of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., as cha rman and Dr. S. H. DeVault of the Extension Service as secretary.

This committee made a careful survey of the situation in early spring, appointed sub-committees with County Agents as members in all counties, and mailed questionnaires to all farmers through the County Agents. Contacts were established with the U. S. Employment Service and other agencies, such as the NYA and CCC. A cooperative agreement was worked out between the Maryland Selective Service and the State Agricultural Planning Committee relative to occupational deferment of laborers essential for farm work. As a result, out of 2,020 cases for which occupational deferment was asked, 2,000 persons were deferred and 20 were refused deferment. Through the medium of the State Farm Labor Committee and the U. S. Employment Service a total of about 5,000 farm laborers were placed on Maryland farms in 1941. Greater difficulties will confront this committee in the farm labor field in 1942, but additional measures are planned to deal with this acute problem.

General Activities

LIMITED funds prevented enlarging the force to meet the constantly increasing load placed upon the Extension staff at headquarters and in the field. As a result, some regular activities suffered in order to meet the urgent needs of the defense program. The general confidence of farmers and homemakers that has been established by the Service made it the medium through which all defense activities affecting agriculture were launched.

With the growing indications during the summer and fall of the impending involvement of this country in the world conflict, all efforts were directed toward studying our production status and ways and means to aid in the lend-lease enterprise. The appointment of State and County War Boards in September immediately launched a definite program of increased production of badly needed commodities.

The Extension Service assisted in the farm-to-farm canvass and the setting up of production goals in accordance with the goals established in the national program. Meetings of producers, called jointly by the War Boards and Extension Service, were held in all counties of the State prior to the farm canvass by county AAA committeemen.

When the first selective service draft showed a large percentage of rejections that were due primarily to improper nutrition, a vigorous effort was made to correct that weakness. While nutrition work has been a prominent phase of home demonstration extension, the specialists and agents in that field redoubled their efforts.

The Pearl Harbor episode on December 7, 1941, changed the whole attitude of the general public from preparation for defense to militant prosecution of war against the aggressors.

The burden on the agricultural forces of the nation was correspondingly increased. They were called upon for unprecedented production under severe handicaps for labor and many of the materials commonly employed in conducting farm operations efficiently.

The national food situation was reviewed immediately and additional goals were set in an all-out production effort for 1942. Their share of these national goals were accepted by Maryland, the several counties, and by the individual producers. To obtain the greatly increased production by Maryland farmers, the farm labor situation becomes increasingly acute, and the restrictions on steel, rubber, sugar, etc., present extremely difficult problems with which farm people seriously need all the assistance that can be given them.

Soil Conservation

MARKED progress was made during the year in establishing soil conservation districts. At the end of the year, ten districts were organized comprising about 3,049,473 acres. This work is conducted in close association with the Extension Service, as the Director is Chairman of the State Soil Conservation Committee set up in the law providing for the State's cooperation with the U. S. Soil Conservation Service. Relationships with this division of the U. S. Department of Agriculture have been most agreeable and cooperative.

The county agents have done splendid work in the respective counties in organizing and encouraging conservation measures. We are grateful to the State Coordinator, Edward M. Davis, of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and all the technicians for their cooperative attitude in all of this work.

Tobacco Marketing

THE question of loose-leaf versus hogshead marketing of tobacco continued a burning issue in Southern Maryland. In January 1941, Governor O'Conor appointed a special committee with the Extension Director as chairman to investigate the tobacco marketing question and report to the Legislature then in session. Other members of that committee were Claude Turner and Bennett Darnell.

Hearings were held by the committee with growers, buyers, commission men, warehousemen, and manufacturers. A brief, but comprehensive, report discussing all phases of the marketing problem was submitted to the Governor. No action was taken by the Legislature except that further studies were authorized.

Crop Yields and Values

MARYLAND harvested 1,594,300 acres of all crops, including truck crops, in 1941, which is about 2 percent less than the acreage harvested in 1940 and about 4 percent below the average acreage for the period 1930-39. The acreages of oats, barley, tame hay, and tobacco showed increases and there were decreases in the acreages of corn, wheat and rye.

Despite one of the most abnormal seasons in history most grain crops produced yields per acre above 1940 and above the average, except barley which suffered from dry weather. Hay and potato yields were reduced by dry weather. The tobacco crop made excellent progress early in the season, but dry weather and loss of fertilizer by leaching retarded its development.

The 1941 total farm value of principal Maryland crops, including truck crops, was $57,243,000, or 16 percent higher than the 1940 valuation of $49,177,000. The increased total valuation, while due in part to larger harvests for some crops, is due primarily to better prices received by growers for practically every crop.

In keeping with the custom of former years, the acreage, yields and values of principal crops and livestock are given in the following table, as reported by the Maryland Crop Reporting Service.

PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF CROPS

Crop and Year	Acres	Per Acre	Total	Unit	Per Unit	Total Value	Value per Acre
Corn							
1941	446,000	34.0	15,164.000	Bus.	$.77	$14,676,000	$26.18
1940	495,000	33.0	16,335,000	"	.68	11,108,000	22.44
1939	506,000	36.0	18,216,000	"	.63	11,476,000	22.68
Wheat							
1941	345,000	21.0	7,245,000	"	1.07	7,752,000	22.47
1940	363,000	19.0	6,897,000	"	.78	5,380,000	14.82
1939	377,000	19.5	7,352,000	"	.78	5,735,000	15.20
Oats							
1941	32,000	32.0	1,024,000	"	.52	532,000	16.62
1940	29,000	32.0	928,000	"	.44	408,000	14.10
1939	41,000	27.5	1,128,000	"	.44	496,000	12.10
Barley							
1941	78,000	26.0	2,028,000	"	.62	1,257,000	16.11
1940	73,000	27.5	2,008,000	"	.51	1,024,000	14.00
1939	72,000	30.0	2,160,000	"	.48	1,037,000	14.40
Rye							
1941	15,000	14.0	210,000	"	.74	155,000	10.33

PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF CROPS—Continued

Crop and Year	Acres	Per Acre	Total	Unit	Per Unit	Total Value	Value per Acre
1940	16,000	12.5	200,000	"	.59	118,000	7.38
1939	20,000	12.5	250,000	"	.65	162,500	8.10
Buckwheat							
1941	5,000	20.0	100,000	"	.71	71,000	14.20
1940	5,000	18.0	90,000	"	.63	57,000	11.40
1939	5,000	20.0	100,000	"	.64	64,000	12.80
Potatoes							
1941	20,000	96.0	1,920,000	"	.75	1,440,000	72.00
1940	20,000	116.0	2,320,000	"	.63	1,462,000	73.10
1939	25,000	95.0	2,375,000	"	.91	2,161,000	86.44
Sweet Potatoes							
1941	8,000	130.0	1,040,000	"	1.05	1,092,000	136.50
1940	8,000	175.0	1,400,000	"	.85	1,190,000	148.75
1939	9,000	160.0	1,440,000	"	.70	1,008,000	112.00
Hay (All Tame)							
1941	419,000	1.13	472,000	Tons	14.60	6,891,000	16.45
1940	411,000	1.34	550,000	"	11.10	6,105,000	14.85
1939	412,000	1.25	517,000	"	10.60	5,480,000	13.30
Tobacco							
1941	40,300	740.0	29,822.000	Lbs.	.35	10,438,000	259.00
1940	38,400	850.0	32,640.000	"	.33	10,771,000	280.00
1939	40,000	820.0	32,800,000	"	2.12	6,954,000	183.85
Apples (Com'l Crop)							
1941	.....	.....	2,070,000	Bus.	.90	1,863,000	.....
1940	.....	.....	2,077,000	"	.67	1,392,000	.....
1939	.....	.....	2,362,000	"	.62	1,337,000	.....
Peaches							
1941	.....	.....	462,000	"	.90	416,000	.....
1940	.....	.....	470,000	"	.85	400,000	.....
1939	.....	.....	427,000	"	.95	406,000	.....
Tomatoes (For Mfg.)							
1941	54,800	5.1	279,500	Tons	21.30	5,953,000	108.60
1940	47,400	5.0	237,000	"	10.50	2,488,000	52.50
1939	45,500	4.2	191,100	"	13.90	2,656,000	58.37
Sweet Corn (For Mfg.)							
1941	37,750	2.4	90,600	"	11.10	1,006,000	26.65
1940	27,600	2.1	58,000	"	9.60	557,000	20.20
1939	25,300	2.1	53,100	"	9.10	483,000	19.10
Cantaloupes							
1941	7,500	90.0	675,000	Crts.	.65	439,000	58.53
1940	8,000	110.0	880,000	"	.70	616,000	77.00
1939	9,100	95.0	864,000	"	.60	518,000	56.92
Strawberries							
1941	7,000	60.0	420,000	"	2.45	1,029,000	147.00
1940	7,900	90.0	711,000	"	1.75	1,244,000	157.47
1939	7,900	60.0	474,000	"	2.15	1,019,000	129.00
Snap Beans (For Mfg.)							
1941	12,400	1.3	16,100	Tons	53.00	853,000	68.80
1940	10,900	1.7	18,500	"	41.20	762,000	70.00
1939	10,000	1.6	16,000	"	39.80	637,000	63.70
Green Peas (For Mfg.)							
1941	18,700	1600 Lbs.	14,960	"	57.10	854,000	53.37
1940	16,200	2000 "	16,200	"	55.00	891,000	55.00
1939	15,800	1260 "	9,950	"	50.50	502,000	31.80

LIVESTOCK ON FARMS

January 1, 1942

	Number	Value Per Head	Total Value
Horses and Colts	79,000	$84.00	$6,644,000
Mules and Mule Colts	24,000	108.00	2,592,000
Dairy Cows and Heifers (2 yrs. old and over)	208,000	94.00	19,552,000
All Other Cattle and Calves	137,000	40.90	5,605,000
Sheep and Lambs	61,000	8.90	542,000
Swine, Including Pigs	219,000	10.70	2,350,000
Chickens	4,193,000	.93	3,899,000
Turkeys	78,000	3.70	289,000

ADMINISTRATION

IN no previous year has the administration of extension work in Maryland been more difficult, principally because of lack of funds to meet the ordinary expenses of the Service. At the beginning of the Federal fiscal year July 1, the Service was cut $10,961.75 by the withdrawal of funds by the U. S. Department of Agriculture which had been received for cooperative employment of specialists and agents. These funds were from the Land Use, AAA, and Farm Security Administrations. These cuts were not indicated nor ant ci-pated in the preparation of our regular budget, nor was it known that they would be made when funds were secured from the State Legislature. Consequently, it has been a tremendous problem to meet the increased demands of the Food-for-Freedom program on the one hand and curtail expenditures to avoid a deficit on the other. Notwithstanding the difficulties, the personnel in the counties has been maintained. We have curtailed in publications, equipment, travel and other operating expenses.

The Service has continued its close relationship with the State Grange, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc., and other rural organizations. The County Commissioners have cooperated wholeheartedly and in several cases have increased their allotments for extension work.

It is only through the unselfish attitude of all members of the force that we have been able to meet and handle the increased burdens resulting from the defense and war activities. I am indebted to the assistant directors and, in fact, to all members of the force for their loyal support and assistance in this trying time.

Changes In Personnel

Charles N. Remsberg resigned as Assistant County Agent in Carroll and Frederick counties November 31, 1940.

Chester M. Cissel was transferred as Assistant County Agent in Queen Anne's county to Carroll and Frederick counties, December 1, 1940.

J. Walter Eby was appointed Assistant County Agent in Queen Anne's county, December 1, 1940.

Mrs. Georgiana Linthicum retired as County Home Demonstration Agent in Anne Arundel county, December 31, 1940.

Miss Frances E. Beegle was transferred from Assistant County Home Demonstration Agent to County Home Demonstration Agent in Anne Arundel county, January 1, 1941.

Miss Dorothy R. Ransom resigned as Assistant Colored Home Demonstration Agent in Southern Maryland, December 31, 1940.

William R. McKnight, County Agent in Dorchester county, entered the military service, February 4, 1941.

Charles Fuller was transferred from Assistant County Agent in Caroline, Dorchester and Talbot counties to Acting County Agent in Dorchester county, February 4, 1941.

Miss Ethel L. Bianchi was appointed Colored Home Demonstration Agent in Southern Maryland, February 15, 1941.

Miss Judith Ault resigned as County Home Demonstration Agent in Wicomico county, February 28, 1941.

Miss Esther W. Bower was appointed County Home Demonstration Agent in Wicomico county, March 1, 1941.

Russell C. Hawes was appointed Baltimore Marketing Specialist June 16, 1941.

James M. Gwin, Egg Marketing Specialist, entered the military service, June 6, 1941.

Mrs. Arminta J. Dixon, Colored Home Demonstration Agent in Southern Maryland, was granted leave of absence, July 5, 1941.

Miss Sybil E. Nance was appointed Assistant Colored Home Demonstration Agent in Southern Maryland, July 16, 1941.

Carl B. Smith resigned as Farm Management Specialist, July 14, 1941.

Howard J. Twilley was reappointed Marketing Specialist, September 1, 1941.

Mrs. Justine N. Clark resigned as Colored Home Demonstration Agent on the Eastern Shore, September 30, 1941.

Miss Angela M. Feiser resigned as County Home Demonstration Agent in Calvert county, September 30, 1941.

Mrs. Florence E. Buchanan was appointed County Home Demonstration Agent in Calvert county, October 1, 1941.

Miss Mary E. Hahn was appointed Assistant County Home Demonstration Agent in Baltimore county, October 1, 1941.

W. D. McClellan resigned as Assistant in Plant Pathology, September 30, 1941.

Sources of Extension Revenue

DURING the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, there were available for Extension Work the following funds: Federal Smith-Lever, $60,023.83; Bankhead-Jones, $105,496.71; Capper-Ketcham, $26,076.61; Further Development Funds, $3,740.00; State Funds for Agriculture and Home Economics Extension, $99,598.50; Special Dairy Fund, $2,955.11; Cantaloupe Fund, $1,500.00; State Horticultural Fund, $9,706.04; Strawberry Disease Fund, $5,074.99; Tobacco Disease Fund, $6,003.64; Bee Disease Fund, $2,211.22; Fund for Enforcement of Fresh Egg Law, $6,600.73; Soil

Conservation and Drainage Fund, $10,276.77; Miscellaneous Funds, including Advanced Registry, Marketing Inspection Funds, etc., $42,273.97 and $75,334.50 contr buted by the various counties; or a total of $456,872.62. In addit'on, $18,918.01 was used for Insect Control Work, and $11,181.51 was disbursed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; making a grand total of $486,972.14. Also $41,818.44 was used from an emergency appropriation for Japanese Beetle Control.

During the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, there are available: Federal Smith-Lever, $63,063.69; Bankhead-Jones, $108,182.11; Capper-Ketcham, $26,453.25; State Funds for Agriculture and Home Economics Extension, $105,400.50; Special Dairy Fund, $3,233.69; Cantaloupe Fund, $1,500.00; State Horticultural Funds, $11,545.56; Strawberry Disease Fund, $4,500.00; Tobacco Disease Fund, $4,500.00; Bee Disease Fund, $2,000.00; Fund for Enforcement of Fresh Egg Law, $7,125,00; Soil Conservation and Drainage Funds, $8,475.00; Quick Soil Testing, $2,250 00; Miscellaneous Funds (estimated), including Advanced Registry, Special Marketing and Marketing Inspection Funds, etc., $57,275.00; and $79,245.50 contributed by the various counties; or a total of $484,749.30. In addition, there are available $18,542.75 for Insect Control Work, and $2,820.00 disbursed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; making a grand total of $506,112.05. Also, there is available about $40,000.00 for official Japanese Beetle Control Work in cooperation with the U. S. Bureau of Plant Quarantine.

PUBLICATIONS

PUBLICATIONS of various types, visual aids such as charts and illustrations, and exhibits were effective means for disseminating information by the Extension Service on practically all the programs carried on during the year. They were especially helpful in giving farm people specific information regarding the food and feed production program which was essential for their participation.

More than 40,000 copies of printed publications issued by the Service were prepared in 1941, in addition to a four-page monthly paper sent to 2,500 leaders each month.

The public press of Maryland is an asset of the Extension Service whose value is fully realized by very few people. The daily and weekly papers, and other forms of the public press devoted l?rge space to extension programs and activities and the kinds of information the Extension Service was anxious to carry to farm people. As a means of reaching the rank and file of people, both rural and urban, probably no other avenue is more effective.

More than 300 news and information stores were sent to the public press, in addit on to the large number originating in the several counties and used in one or more local papers.

ACTIVITIES OF EXTENSION AGENTS

A FEW figures taken from the summary of reports submitted by county agents and home demonstration agents in the several counties give a partial impression of the extent to which they are reaching and serving the rural people of the State.

These extension agents made 22,182 farm or home visits to 10,313 different farms or homes. There were 119,454 calls at their offices and 83,715 telephone calls for information or pertaining to matters connected with extension activities. Together the agents prepared 5,334 articles or stories for publication. They wrote 65,599 individual letters and 4,126 different circular letters. As a service to those who desired more complete information on various subjects, they distributed 64,762 bulletins. That the radio has a part in extension work is indicated by the fact that the agents broadcast or prepared 355 programs. Likewise, the place of exhibits is shown by the 350 which the agents prepared or helped to prepare.

Demonstrations have always been a feature of extension teaching. While some of the emergency activities required much of the attention of extension agents, they conducted 5,868 methods demonstrations with an attendance of 101,998, and 219 results demonstrations which were explained to 3,704 people. In addition to those mentioned, the extension agents or specialists participated in 5,472 meetings of an extension nature, with attendance of 308,251

Changes in practices as a result of extens on work were reported on 27,687 farms, in 9,684 farm homes, and in 6,241 other homes. There were 4-H club members reported in 5,493 farm homes and 2,263 other homes. A total of 33,310 farm families and 11,888 other families reported that they had been influenced by the extension program.

COUNTY DEMONSTRATION WORK

IN the strenuous situation incident to the drastically changed economy brought about by the defense program and later the war program rural people found extension workers their most trusted advisers. Patiently, wisely and calmly county agents guided farm people, advising them of adjustments that were necessary in their production plans, guiding them into the soundest ways for expanding their production and cautioning against splurging in the hopes of a repetition of the war-time prices that prevailed during the first world war. This was not a time to sacrifice conservation, nor to incur indebtedness, but a time to pay off debt and make improvements, the county agents urged.

Farmers responded magnificently to the advice of extension workers, who through years of sound and faithful leadership and service have gained the confidence of rural people. Production

goals have been attained, the live-at-home program has been revitalized, the nutrition program has become a home living program, and a free, aggressive farm leadership responded to the influence of extension workers in coordinating all programs for the benefit of rural people.

A complete extension organization in all counties has been maintained throughout the year with a county agent in each county and with seven assistant agents serving eleven counties. Both white and colored farmers are served and in areas of densest colored population on the Eastern Shore and in Southern Maryland two colored agents are employed.

The two State leaders gave helpful and adequate supervision to the county agents in their many activities. Especially were they helpful in making the changes necessary to adapt the program in the several counties to the needs of the defense and war programs, and making other changes brought about by the greatly altered economic situation.

HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK

EACH year demonstrates increased interest in all extension programs. The nutrition project shows results in the number of people who have become nutrition minded and who are feeding their families according to the newer methods of nutrition. Very definite work has been done with all agencies in this project. Clothing has continued to be of interest. Requests have come for help in coat schools and dress making schools, many of which could not be taken care of due to lack of time and travel funds. Home management and home furnishing reports show very definite results.

Local leaders have rendered invaluable assistance in all projects and greatly magnified the effectiveness of extension workers.

For the last five years the theme has been "Better Family Living." Such a program encourages all members of the family to utilize valuable resources so that the family can enjoy health and comfort. Help has been given by agents and specialists, in both agriculture and home economics, to make the home more attractive outdoors and indoors.

The counties carrying school lunch programs under the direction of home demonstration agents and the nutrition specialist, in cooperation with the State Public Health nurses, have improved the health of many rural children who attend one-room schools. Hundreds of rural children have health and nutrition habits improved as a result of proper lunches.

The cultural project stands out in the contribution it has made to family life and is recognized in all home demonstration programs.

The satisfaction that comes to the homemaker and all members of the family from reading better books, knowing good music and good pictures, taking part in recreational activities, standing on their feet and talking about the things they enjoy and love are among the results of the cultural project. It has done much to bring members of the family together and opened the way to better relations.

The annual Women's Short Course at the University is always a vital feature of home demonstration work. Seventy-five percent of those who attend are members of homemakers' clubs. They come for the purpose of getting all they can out of the short course and are willing to carry back to their communities the information obtained during the week at the University. It has been gratifying to see how leadership has grown among the women.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' 4-H CLUB WORK

THE work of boys and girls enrolled in 4-H Club work was not affected by emergency developments to as great extent as that of adults and consequently their programs were carried out more nearly as planned.

From the standpoint of the national increased food production program developed during the year, the boys' club work made a worthwhile contribution. The following resume indicates their activities in food production.

Project	Number completing	Number of animals
Dairy	847	1,416
Beef Cattle	139	201
Swine	619	2,033
Sheep	73	739
Poultry	790	63,738
Gardens	972	
Crops	309	
Conservation	518	

In addition to projects of this type, the members of 4-H clubs engaged in a wide variety of other activities such as farm accounting, rural electrification, health, and safety. The training and development they derived and leadership they developed through their inspirational events, camps, tours, and other events they planned and carried out during the year was notable.

Four-H Club Week at College Park, the conference of the Maryland State Council of 4-H Clubs n Baltimore, the All Star meeting at Braddock Heights, State 4-H Conservation Camp, Western Maryland and Harford County Camps were larger and better than ever before. This was also true of 4-H participation in such events as Timonium Fair, Baltimore Livestock Show, National Dairy Show, National 4-H Club Congress, Neppco Poultry Show, Nationa 4-H Club Week and the Tri-State Older Youth meeting.

The increased interest on the part of adults in better nutrition and health was reflected in the work of girls' 4-H clubs. The leader of that work reports that every club girl has become conscious of the importance of good nutrition well-planned meals, and the responsibility of farm families to provide the right kinds of food through their own production programs.

Every county has carried a strong clothing program, with construction schools held during the spring and summer, followed by style revues. The garments made by club members under direction of their leaders have been of a high professional standard. A fair proportion of the club members carried other home-making demonstrations, including home furnishing, home management, and gardening.

The training given 4-H club boys and girls will be of added value to them and for the welfare of the country in view of the unsettled conditions ahead. They are trained to think for themselves, to cooperate in community affairs, and to take responsibility when occasion demands.

FARM CROPS AND LIVESTOCK

Field Crops—When the vital need for greatly increased production of certain farm products became apparent late in the year, it was gratifying to all concerned to note that an outstanding project in which extension workers in farm crops, livestock and dairy had been combining their efforts was in direct line with the needs. A well organized program in "Livestock Feeding and Home-Grown Feed Production" was launched three years ago and has grown rapidly each year. County agents in all the counties which have participated say that it has been one of the most effective extension programs they have undertaken.

Efficient production and wise use of home-grown feeds is an important factor in the success of the livestock and dairy industries of the State, which provide by far the largest source of cash farm income. At a time when record production of dairy and livestock products is vitally needed, the well coordinated program to that end has proved exceedingly valuable.

One of the outstanding achievements in extension farm crops work was the expansion of seed improvement. More certified seed was produced than in any past year. A systematic program for pasture improvement also made much progress. Popular interest in field corn hybrids increased during the year as leading hybrids continued to demonstrate superiority in yield, standability, and soundness. Soil fertility work was an important part of practically all crop improvement efforts and the demand for soil tests and definite fertility recommendations increased.

Mention has already been made of rapid strides made in organized soil conservation through the extension of soil conservation districts to include a large percentage of the farm land of the State.

After thorough consideration by all agencies concerned, it was decided to emphasize a seven-point program of simple, inexpensive measures. They included: Plow, plant and cultivate across the slope, leaving gullies in sod; follow all cultivated crops with a cover crop; keep all land covered over winter; lime and fertilize pastures and provide mid-summer pastures; prevent crop losses on wet land by making provision for adequate drainage; meet production goals as far as possible by more intensive use of the better land rather than by plowing up land that should not be cultivated. Farmers were encouraged to supplement these simple measures to the extent their conditions permitted by terraces, contour strip cropping, and the like.

Dairy—Maryland milk producers were called upon to greatly increase their production early in the year and the goals set in the national food production program were comparatively small in comparison with the need in this region. The influx of workers in government agencies and in industries in connection with the defense program required great expansion in the supply of fluid milk available.

When the cooperative organizations through which Maryland farmers market their milk called for larger supplies, the extension specialists and agents put into effect a program to help producers step up their production in a sound and economic manner. The home-grown feed program fit into this effort; practical rations for higher production per cow were needed; culling was modified to some extent, so as to keep some of the cows in production longer and thereby increase the herd; and, there were calls for assistance in locating desirable dairy animals.

All types of cow testing carried on by the Extension Service were continued and increased during the year.

Livestock—Favorable prices for livestock and livestock products which prevailed during the year were responsible for increased interest in all phases of that industry and corresponding demand for help from extension workers in that field. The series of feeding schools and timely letters sent to stockmen in connection with the joint feeding and feed production program proved especially effective. They assisted producers in making the most from the materials they had and enabled them to take full advantage of the favorable conditions.

There was a considerable increase in the numbers of beef cattle and hogs on farms in the State at the end of this year, as compared with a year ago, which reflects the efforts of Maryland farmers to provide their share of the meat needed in the war program.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Fruits—Almost every year there are problems affecting the fruit industry which require special assistance by extension workers, in addition to the programs planned by them in the line of more efficient and profitable production and marketing. In this respect 1941 was no exception.

For the last few years the marketing situation for apples has been difficult, due to cutting off the export demand by the war. The specialist has been active in assisting growers to obtain greater publicity for Maryland apples through an organized effort. This aid has proved of untold value to the industry and is a phase of marketing in which extension assistance was essential.

When the peach marketing situation looked serious, a campaign was carried out to encourage "Canning for Defense." The results, according to a questionnaire sent to dealers, were very good to excellent, some dealers reporting amazing sales increases.

Tree removal, planting new orchards on the contour, maintenance of fertility, control of insect pests and diseases, and other features of the long-time program for production of more and better fruit economically, were given as much attention as facilities and personnel permitted.

Vegetables—Home vegetable gardens assumed added importance because of the greater emphasis on nutrition and the need for providing as much home-grown food for the family as possible. While a large percentage of Maryland farm families have a garden each year, the quantity and quality of products obtained can be decidedly improved.

Reports show that about 10,000 persons followed the recommendations of the Extension Service regarding vegetable gardens. As has been mentioned, garden projects are popular with 4-H boys and girls and records from 16 counties show 190 acres devoted by them to vegetable gardens.

Canning Crops—Probably the most important work carried on during the year was in connection with the Government program to secure an increased pack of tomatoes for lend-lease and other uses. Although the announcement came a couple of months too late for necessary preliminary work, other canning crops work was subordinated until all possible arrangements could be made to secure an increased acreage and yield. In spite of the late announcement, there was a 16 percent increase in acreage over 1940 and a 42 percent increase in yield over the average for the last ten years.

Two unusual features developed in connection with the Ten-Ton Tomato contest, which was conducted for the fourteenth consecutive year. The contest was won by a woman, Mrs. Rowena Tull of Talbot County. With a yield of 21.16 tons per acre on 6.92 acres, she broke

the record for the entire period of the contest by more than three tons per acre.

Ornamental Gardening—It is true, no doubt, that efforts to produce more food, and other defense activities in which so many farm people engaged, detracted somewhat from the interest in home-ground improvement which has been to active in recent years. Nevertheless, pride in their surroundings continued strong and both adults and boys and girls sought much assistance in this line. Records from the counties show that 244 members of 4-H clubs completed their work for the year, and that 3,520 adults carried on some phase of home beautification under the Extension Service program.

POULTRY

EGGS and poultry products were among the commodities for which there was need for greatest increase in the Food-for-Freedom program. Extension workers took the leadership in helping poultry producers to expand their operations on a safe and sound basis. As a result of this close cooperation with the well-organized poultry industry, no difficulty has been experienced in more than meeting the desired increase.

The immense broiler industry which has developed in recent years on the Eastern Shore was a potential source for producing vast quantities of badly needed food, but was confronted with many problems in which assistance was sought.

Under the broad Maryland Poultry Improvement Program, definite progress is being made each year in all aspects of more efficient production of higher quality poultry products. Westminster Cooperative Egg Auction, established in Carroll County in 1939, has shown a very satisfactory growth in volume of products and service to patrons during 1941.

A Turkey Improvement Program, very similar to the one carried on for chickens, was in full operation. Flock selecting agents qualified to select breeding turkeys for the Approved Breeding Stage of the plan were chosen at two turkey improvement schools, which were attended by 68 persons. Flocks for breeding birds and also flocks supplying eggs to hatcheries were inspected during February and March for breeding quality and removal of birds reacting to the pullorum test, and reports of the inspections were sent to both breeders and hatcherymen, with suggestions for improvement.

FORESTRY

A NUMBER of factors had a bearing on the extension work in forestry during the year which were different from those prevailing in past years.

This was the first full year in the operation of a regional forestry project carried on cooperatively by the Extension Service, the the Soil Conservation Service, and the Maryland Department of State Forests and Parks. The territory includes Harford county and the purpose is to show the possibilities of increased farm income and better farm living through intensive management of farm woodland.

As a result of defense activities, forest products moved on the market in great volume and at good prices. This situation called for educational effort to avoid unwise and wasteful cutting, and to assist woodland owners in getting the fair value of their products.

The usual extension educational efforts were made in the lines of protection of forests from fire, thinning, avoidance of over-grazing, and other approved practices. Among the most effective work was that carried on with 4-H club boys in a number of counties.

TOBACCO

EXTENSION work with the tobacco industry included practically all factors which enter into more efficient production of high-quality tobacco, and also the problems involved in handling and marketing the crop.

Further progress was made in demonstrating to growers the value of improved varieties as compared with strains or hybrids of unknown origin. They were urged to have their seed cleaned and tested for germination. Demonstrations of the use of cyanamid to control weeds in seed beds were continued.

As has been mentioned, the tobacco marketing problem was acute during the year. A thorough study of that problem by a special committee appointed by the Governor, of which the Extension Director was chairman, was made and a report submitted to the Legislature. It was pointed out that the committee was not disposed to interfere with legitimate business or investment and that its recommendations are not directed at any individual or group of individuals.

INSECTS AND PLANT DISEASES

Insect Control—As in recent years, the fight to retard the progress of the Japanese beetle was the largest single project in insect control extension work, but help was rendered in control of pests of practically all crops, animals, and of the home.

The main objectives in the Japanese beetle program were: To establish disease and parasites for the purpose of obtaining permanent relief from serious damage and to reduce the beetle to the status of a native pest; to coordinate and make available to

farmers and others practical information on effective temporary control until permanent relief can be obtained; to delay increase and spread of beetles in lightly infested areas by the effective use of traps, milky white disease and other timely work; and, to demonstrate under field conditions the effectiveness of all types of control advocated.

The spray service for fruits, which has been conducted for a number of years and upon which practically all orchardists in the State depend, was carried out during the year. Work for the control of canning crop insects and pests of field crops was carried on along very similar lines to those of recent years, varying from year to year according to the intensity of outbreaks of the various pests. There was demand for a large amount of service covering household pests, greenhouse pests, nursery pests, insect pests of golf courses, and rodent control.

Apiculture—The major portion of extension work in apiculture was designed to educate beekeepers in the fundamentals of bee biology and modern apiary practices. Work was continued with the fruit growers in an effort to place more bee colonies in orchards for pollinizing. Apiary inspections were conducted for the second year on a state-wide basis. Eleven resident regional inspectors visited nearly 800 beekeepers in conducting county inspections. They did a fine teaching job in addition to their paid duties as inspectors.

Plant Diseases—By visits to 109 orchards and examination of apple leaves, growers were guided as to the best time for applying sprays to control diseases. This is a part of the spray service conducted in cooperation with the insect control work and has proved of great value.

The value of disease-free seed and seedlings, seed bed treatments, sanitation and sprays was demonstrated for control of various diseases of vegetable crops, including those grown for home use, for commercial markets, and for canning. Use of disease-resistant varieties of different vegetables and strict adherence to proper crop rotations for control of root rots and other soil-borne diseases were other means by which growers were helped in reducing the great losses suffered in damage to their crops.

One of the outstanding services rendered to growers in control of diseases threatening their crops is that provided the strawberry growers since red stele made its appearance in Maryland in 1937. As an indication of the progress made in controlling this disease, it can be pointed out that inspection of 914 acres in the spring of 1939 called for condemnation of 17.1%, whereas it was only necessary to condemn 6.3% of 1,045 acres inspected in the spring of 1941. Some very promising resistant selections have been developed and it is ex-

spected that these will soon give berry growers a method for controlling red stele.

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

THE past year could have been the peak year of rural electrification development had not the war made it necessary to stop new construction, limit work under way, and limit connections to those who meet special requirements. Everything considered, great progress was made. Seven out of every ten farms in Maryland now have electricity available, but two out of seven are not making use of the service. County agents in 14 counties spent thousands of hours in developing the R. E. A. program, as well as working with farmers on right-of-way problems, layout and routing lines, location of sub-stations, general engineering problems of local nature, and wiring and lighting of the farm home and buildings.

The program of the specialist in this field had to be modified to a considerable extent because of emergency activities. However, he carried out an extensive educational program pertaining to electrical equipment, and its operation, planning wiring, planning lighting, care and repair, and home utilities.

Farmer interest continued to increase rapidly in the production, sale and use of frozen foods. Maryland now has 11 locker storage plants serving Maryland families and on the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Delaware more than 5,000,000 pounds of vegetables, fruits, berries and sea foods were frozen commercially and shipped to city markets.

The foundation for assisting farm people to obtain better farm structures is a building plan service, which has grown until it is now possible to furnish them blue print working drawings for practically every design they may desire. During 1941, in response to specific requests, 371 farm building plans were sent to 187 individuals. In addition, 25 visits were made to farms by the extension agricultural engineer for the purpose of personal consultation regarding farm structures remodeling and construction problems.

The program in drainage was materially expanded in 1940 and the expanded program was continued through 1941 under the direction of an extension specialist in that line of work.

In the latter part of the year the extension agricultural engineers were called upon to assume heavy responsibility and leadership in some of the defense measures. They did outstanding work in organizing and conducting a campaign for the care and repair of farm machinery and equipment, and in encouraging farmers to order early the machinery they absolutely needed.

MARKETING

THE year confronted growers of Maryland's widely diversified farm crops and products with many unusual situations and problems with respect to marketing. The greatly increased demand as compared with recent years made it necessary for producers to alter their methods and for extension workers to so change their planned programs as to be of greatest assistance in making the adjustments.

The Federal-State inspection service for fruits, vegetables, potatoes, tomatoes, sweet potatoes, eggs and dressed poultry was continued. The demand for this service, contrary to the trend for many years, was not as great. Favorable prices as a result of the demand which was stimulated by defense and lend-lease programs made it possible for producers of some commodities to easily dispose of their crops without special effort. The use of a large volume of apples by canneries is an example. Nevertheless, a summary shows that this service inspected 291,215 bushels of apples; 42,074 crates of strawberries, 294,972 bushels of potatoes; 43,079 lugs of fresh tomatoes; 35,022 bushels of peaches; and 31,827 bushels of sweet potatoes. Inspections also included 1,178,619 dozens of eggs and 98,025 pounds of dressed poultry.

The inspection service in Maryland had a vital part in helping the Surplus Marketing Administration to carry out programs of purchasing which were of inestimable value to producers of a number of products.

Specialists in each of the several lines and agents in the counties work closely with the producers of all kinds of farm commodities in the marketing problems which develop.

STATE HORTICULTURAL DEPARTMENT

THE Extension Director has for many years directed the work of the State Horticultural Department and the functions of the two services have been closely coordinated. The State Horticultural Department is concerned with control and inspection features, but the fact that to a large extent the same personnel operates in both capacities makes it possible to incorporate much educational extension work with control activities. The State Entomologist and State Plant Pathologist are responsible for active prosecution of the work conducted by the State Horticultural Department and detailed reports are made by them in the biennial report of the University.

CONCLUSION

THE fact that the Extension Service is thoroughly organized and appreciated by the people enables it to carry on such an extended program, even though there has been no expansion in

personnel and expenses during the last few years. Obviously, with the tremendous problems ahead in an all-out war production and other essential measures affecting rural people as well as all others, some emergency funds should be provided to meet the necessities. During the last war considerably increased funds were provided for the emergency. They are doubly needed now. Irrespective of conditions, funds, or anything else, every effort and all power and facilities of the Extension Service will be devoted to assisting farmers and homemakers meet the demands of the war. We must win.

Finally, the writer and all members of the Service appreciate the support and encouragement of President H. C. Byrd.

EXTENSION EMPLOYEES AT HEADQUARTERS

Administrative Staff:

THOMAS B. SYMONS	Director
E. I. OSWALD	Assistant Director
MISS VENIA M. KELLER	Assistant Director
E. N. CORY	Assistant Director
A. H. SNYDER	Extension Editor
P. E. NYSTROM	Co. Agt. Leader and Specialist Farm Mgt.
E. G. JENKINS	State Boys' Club Agent
MISS DOROTHY EMERSON	Girls' Club Agent
MISS FLORENCE H. MASON	Dist. Agent and Spec. in Home Furnishing
MISS K. G. CONNOLLY	Administrative Assistant

Subject Matter Specialists:

*G. J. ABRAMS	Specialist in Apiculture
W. R. BALLARD	Specialist in Landscape and Vegetable Gardening
H. C. BARKER	Specialist in Dairying
W. E. BICKLEY, JR.	Assistant Specialist in Entomology
W. C. BEAVEN	Specialist in Marketing
*H. R. BIRD	Specialist in Poultry Husbandry
*R. W. CARPENTER	Specialist in Agricultural Engineering
O. R. CARRINGTON	Assistant Extension Editor
J. A. CONOVER	Specialist in Dairying
*E. N. CORY	Specialist in Entomology
JOHN COTTON	Specialist in Soil Erosion
*C. E. COX	Specialist in Plant Pathology
*S. H. DEVAULT	Specialist in Agrl. Economics and Farm Mgt.
L. S. DODSON	Specialist in Sociology
LAWRENCE E. DOWNEY	Egg Marketing Specialist
MYLO S. DOWNEY	Assistant in Club Work
*CASTILLO GRAHAM	Specialist in Entomology
*W. E. HARRISON	Assistant Specialist in Marketing
R. C. HAWES	Baltimore Marketing Specialist
*W. F. JEFFERS	Specialist in Plant Pathology
MISS JESSIE D. HINTON	Home Management Specialist
*H. A. HUNTER	Specialist in Canning Crops
*R. A. JEHLE	Specialist in Plant Pathology
*MORLEY A. JULL	Prof. Poultry Husbandry and Head of Dept.
*W. B. KEMP	Specialist in Agronomy
A. V. KREWATCH	Specialist in Rural Electrification
*ALBIN C. KUHN	Specialist in Agronomy
G. S. LANGFORD	Specialist in Insect Control
J. W. MAGRUDER	Specialist in Agronomy
A. F. MARTIN	Specialist in Marketing
MISS MARGARET MCPHEETERS	Specialist in Nutrition
*DEVOE MEADE	Specialist in Animal Husbandry
C. P. MERRICK	Specialist in Drainage
*JAMES B. OUTHOUSE	Specialist in Animal Husbandry
C. P. POPPELL	Specialist in Marketing
W. B. POSEY	Tobacco Specialist
*HARLAN RANDALL	Specialist in Music
W. H. RICE	Specialist in Poultry Husbandry
*A. L. SCHRADER	Specilaist in Horticulture
S. B. SHAW	Specialist in Marketing, and Chief of Md. State Department of Markets
MISS HELEN SHELBY	Specialist in Clothing
M. M. SHOEMAKER	Specialist in Landscape Gardening
*A. S. THURSTON	Specialist in Horticulture
H. J. TWILLEY	Assistant Specialist in Marketing

J. M. VIAL	Specialist in Animal Husbandry
A. F. VIERHELLER	Specialist in Horticulture
R. H. VINCENT	Specialist in Entomology
*E. A. WALKER	Specialist in Plant Pathology
E. P. WALLS	Specialist in Marketing and Canning Crops
F. B. WHITTINGTON	Specialist in Entomology
CHARLES WILLIAMS	Specialist in Poultry
C. F. WINSLOW	Specialist in Forestry

* Part-time Specialist.

COUNTY AGENTS

County	Name	Headquarters
Allegany	R. F. MCHENRY	Cumberland
Anne Arundel	STANLEY E. DAY	Annapolis
Baltimore	H. B DERRICK	Towson
Calvert	JOHN B. MORSELL	Prince Frederick
Caroline	G. W. CLENDANIEL	Denton
Carroll	L. C. BURNS	Westminster
Cecil	J. Z. MILLER	Elkton
Charles	P D. BROWN	LaPlata
Dorchester	WM. R. MCKNIGHT*	Cambridge
Frederick	H. R. SHOEMAKER	Frederick
Garrett	JOHN H. CARTER	Oakland
Harford	H. M. CARROLL	Bel Air
Howard	W. G. MYERS	Ellicott City
Kent	J. D. MCVEAN	Chestertown
Montgomery	O. W. ANDERSON	Rockville
Prince George's	P. E. CLARK	Upper Marlboro
Queen Anne's	MARK MILLER	Centreville
St. Mary's	JULIUS JOHNSON	Leonardtown
Somerset	C. Z. KELLER	Princess Anne
Talbot	R. S. BROWN	Easton
Washington	M. D. MOORE	Hagerstown
Wicomico	J. P. BROWN	Salisbury
Worcester	R. T. GRANT	Snow Hill

Assistant County Agents

County	Name	Headquarters
Allegany and Washington	H. W. BEGGS	Cumberland
Baltimore	J. WHEELER ENSOR	Towson
Harford	W. SHERARD WILSON	Bel Air
Kent	STANLEY SUTTON	Chestertown
Montgomery	RUFUS KING	Rockville
Carroll and Frederick	CHESTER CISSEL	Frederick
Caroline and Talbot	CHARLES FULLER	Easton
Queen Anne's	WALTER EBY	Centerville

Local Agents (Colored)

County	Name	Headquarters
Southern Maryland	M. G. BAILEY	Seat Pleasant
Eastern Shore	L. H. MARTIN	Princess Anne

* On leave of absence for military duty, Mr. Charles Fuller, Cambridge, Md., serving as Acting County Agent.

HOME DEMONSTRATION AGENTS

County	Name	Headquarters
Allegany	MAUDE A. BEAN	Cumberland
Anne Arundel	FRANCES E. BEEGLE	Annapolis
Baltimore	ANNA TRENTHAM	Towson
Calvert	FLORENCE E. BUCHANAN	Prince Frederick
Caroline	BESSIE M. SPAFFORD	Denton
Carroll	ADELINE M. HOFFMAN	Westminster
Cecil	HELEN I. SMITH	Elkton
Charles	MARY GRAHAM	LaPlata
Dorchester	HATTIE E. BROOKS	Cambridge
Frederick	FLORENCE E. WILLIAMS	Frederick
Garrett	MILDRED BARTON	Oakland
Harford	CATHERINE MAURICE	Bel Air
Howard	KATHRYN E. NEWTON	Ellicott City
Kent	HELEN N. SCHELLINGER	Chestertown
Montgomery	EDYTHE N. TURNER	Rockville

Prince George's	ETHEL M. REGAN	Hyattsville
Queen Anne's	HELEN M. HARNER	Centerville
St. Mary's	ETHEL JOY	Leonardtown
Somerset	HILDA TOPPER	Princess Anne
Talbot	MARGARET SMITH	Easton
Washington	ARDATH E. MARTIN	Hagerstown
Wicomico	ESTHER WEIGHTMAN BOWER	Salisbury
Worcester	LUCY J. WALTER	Snow Hill

Assistant Home Demonstration Agents

County	Name	Headquarters
Allegany	MARGARET T. LOAR	Cumberland

Local Home Demonstration Agents (Colored)

County	Name	Headquarters
Charles, St. Mary's, Prince George's and Montgomery	SYBIL E. NANCE	Box 5273 Seat Pleasant, Md.
Charles, St. Mary's, Prince George's and Montgomery	ETHEL BIANCHI, Assistant	Seat Pleasant, Md.
Somerset		Princess Anne, Md.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES, BY PROJECTS, SHOWING SOURCES OF FUNDS USED FOR EXTENSION WORK

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES, BY PROJECTS, SHOWING SOURCES OF FUNDS USED FOR EXTENSION WORK

	Total	Federal Funds			Offset Funds	Funds Not Used As Offset		
		Smith-Lever	Capper-Ketcham	Further Development		College and State	County	Other
Administration	$19,160.58	$7,715.21			$4,609.14	$6,815.98		$20.25
Publications	12,597.49	7,667.00			1,238.85	3,109.13		582.51
County Agent Work	130,803.21	57,061.75	$13,196.89	$3,740.00	17,203.82	961.00	$38,299.75	340.00
Home Demonstration Work	98,788.87	41,813.22	12,879.72		10,081.71	786.03	27,268.21	5,959.98
Extension Club Work	17,054.01	9,298.71			2,871.12	335.03		4,549.15
Agronomy	7,211.02	1,505.08			1,696.11	3,529.60		480.23
Animal Industry	7,084.05	2,598.75			2,414.19	1,919.45		251.66
Horticulture	11,499.30	6,787.31			2,300.84	2,361.48		49.67
Dairying	9,929.62	2,642.70			1,313.05	4,925.25		1,048.62
Agricultural Marketing	23,226.76	1,918.36			1,105.36	14,409.92		5,793.12
Imp. Poultry Husbandry	11,197.65	5,817.85			2,231.28	3,110.32		38.20
Entomological Extension	64,250.96	150.00				64,100.96		
Pathology	15,609.36	344.17				15,265.19		
Canning Crops	4,276.28	2,750.52			938.73	587.03		
Farm Forestry	1,980.71				1,620.00	360.71		
Poultry Marketing	4,140.83	1,264.19			1,155.26	1,468.13		253.25
Rural Engineering	10,358.09	3,455.89			1,288.88	5,455.47		157.85
Home Management	3,377.56	1,995.28			1,224.32	136.69		21.27
Economics and Farm Management	3,361.07	1,343.42			400.25	1,579.35		38.05
Apiculture	4,118.02	150.00				3,957.52		10.50
General Educational Extension	14,082.04					13,357.21		724.83
Extension Work in Rural Sociology	580.07					537.52		42.55
Tobacco	4,357.58	3,151.18			1,024.70	181.70		
Home Furnishing	2,011.19	1,236.13			711.90	63.16		
Nutrition	3,702.24	2,430.25			1,153.06	89.38		29.55
Clothing	3,513.91	2,323.57			1,137.87	15.12		37.35
Soil Conservation	5,254.55	100.00				5,107.22		47.33
Total Expenditures	$493,527.02	$165,520.54	$26,076.61	$3,740.00	$57,720.44	$154,425.55	$65,567.96	$20,475.92

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FOR EXTENSION WORK, BY ITEMS OF EXPENSE AND SOURCES OF FUNDS

	Total	Federal Funds			Offset Funds	Funds Not Used As Offset		
		Smith-Lever	Capper-Ketcham	Further Development		College and State	County	Other
Personal Services:								
Salaries—								
Administrative	$18,282.50	$11,221.16			$2,953.00	$4,108.34		
Supervisory	9,985.00	8,154.14			1,830.86			
Specialists	106,240.56	38,604.65			13,664.00	50,330.25		$3,641.66
Agents	137,392.24	75,211.50	$26,076.61	$3,740.00	17,904.63		$14,417.00	42.50
Clerks—Headquarters	27,611.22	14,048.74			6,451.19	6,204.37		906.92
Clerks—County	25,997.84	6,611.48			1,344.54	20.86	18,020.96	
Labor	22,698.01					22,662.24		35.77
Supplies and Materials	22,436.64	2,047.63			473.69	12,381.27	5,974.00	1,560.05
Communication Service:								
Telephone and Telegraph	2,965.11	1,162.50			9.65	1,460.76		332.20
Postage	1,532.88	258.71				820.89		453.28
Travel Expenses:								
Administrative	2,026.76	30.70			1,721.65	210.86		63.55
Supervisory	2,164.47	144.61			1,579.71	314.90		125.25
Specialists	28,613.37	652.22			6,450.33	20,609.10		901.75
Agents	31,425.77	427.37			3,210.30	623.00	27,156.00	9.10
Non-Scientific	8,376.05					454.60		7,921.45
Transportation of Things	1,130.85	110.88			21.89	992.04		6.04
Printing, Binding, Etc.	2,564.88	77.62			105.00	1,834.75		547.51
Furnishing of Heat, Light, Etc.	61.82	33.40				28.42		
Equipment	13,372.94	62.04				12,688.31		622.59
Miscellaneous:								
Rent	1,810.01	60.00				693.35		1,056.66
Repairs to Equipment	375.20	101.19				167.64		106.37
Laundry Service	10.00							10.00
Not Elsewhere Classified	26,452.90	6,500.00				17,819.60		2,133.30
Total Expenditures	$493,527.02	$165,520.54	$26,076.61	$3,740.00	$57,720.44	$154,425.55	$65,567.96	$20,475.92

Total Expenditures	$493,527.02	$165,520.54	$26,076.61	$3,740.00	$57,720.44	$154,425.55	$65,567.96	$20,475.92